Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNI	A

DARIUS CLARK, et al., Plaintiffs,

v.

YODLEE, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. <u>20-cv-05991-SK</u>

AMENDED NOTICE OF **QUESTIONS FOR HEARING**

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD, PLEASE TAKE NOTICE OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS FOR THE HEARING SCHEDULED ON SEPTEMBER 9, 2024 AT 9:30 A.M. The Court intends to address the questions below at the hearing. The Court advises the parties that it will not accept written answers to the questions.

The parties shall be prepared to address the following questions at the hearing:

- The Court is inclined to find that Plaintiffs Cotrell, Rollier, and Szeto either lack (1) standing or would not be typical representatives to represent a class of individuals who had their transactional data obtained, stored, used, or sold by Yodlee because there is no evidence that Yodlee obtained transactional data from these named Plaintiffs. The parties should be prepared to address the impact such a finding on Plaintiffs' remaining claims. In particular, the parties should address, claim by claim: (1) what, if any, part of the claims remain; (2) what damages, if any, Plaintiffs seek; and (3) what injunctive relief, if any, Plaintiffs seek.
- (2) What is the estimated size of Plaintiffs' proposed classes? On what evidence do Plaintiffs rely for this estimation?
- (3) Are there any experts remaining who are not already the subject of a pending motion to strike or exclude? If so, who are these experts and do the parties intend

Case 3:20-cv-05991-SK Document 588 Filed 09/03/24 Page 2 of 2

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
	10
	11
nia	12
liforr	13
of Ca	14
trict	15
n Dis	16
rthen	17
No	18
	19
	20
	21
	22
	23
	24
	25
	26
	27

28

United States District Court

to	file	anv	more	motions	to	strike	or	exclude	experts'
$\iota \circ$	1110	any	more	monons	w	Suike	OI	CACIUUC	CAPCILS

(4) For the remaining claims based on the information Plaintiffs allege Yodlee collected (excluding the transactional data), what is Plaintiffs' best argument that they may pursue a nation-wide class action based on California law, including that the harm was felt in California by out-of-state class members?

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 3, 2024



United States Magistrate Judge